



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,411	01/16/2001	Mai-lan Tomsen	4000.2.11	4790
32641	7590	09/27/2004	EXAMINER	
DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP 201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100 ONE UTAH CENTER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				BELIVEAU, SCOTT E
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2614		

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/761,411	TOMSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Scott Beliveau	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/24/02; 5/21/01</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. However, the provisional application 60/246,542 upon which priority is claimed fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 1-60 of this application. The '542 provisional application fails to disclose a method and system for selectively retrieving and displaying supplemental content related to a television program being displayed as claimed. In particular, fails to clearly disclose or suggest the step of "sensing a change in the television program being displayed". Provisional application no. 60/258,164, however, provides support for the aforementioned claims. Accordingly, the application shall receive the benefit of the '164 provisional application and claims 1-60 shall be examined on the basis of 22 December 2000.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because:
- Reference character "240" has been used to designate both the select button and the find button in Figure 2;
 - Reference character "1120" has been used to designate both searching the internet for related supplemental content and the STB transmitting a selection to the content source in Figure 11.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of

the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 228 (Page 13, Line 13); 1112 (Page 27, Line 25). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters 1316 and 1324 (Figure 13) not mentioned in the description. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the

immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Reference to "a 'Select' button 215" should be amended to reference "a 'Select' button 240" in order to be consistent with Figure 2 (Page 12, Line 11);
 - Reference to element "1314" should be amended to reference element "1310" in order to be consistent with the process flow of Figure 13 (Page 30, Line 24).

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438,

164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1, 4, 7-23, 26-30, 31, 34, 37-53, and 56-60 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20, 24-49, 54-60 of copending Application No. 09/748,080 in view of Wu et al. (US Pat No. 6,326,982). This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

With respect to claims 1 and 31, the co-pending '080 application recites the claimed limitations corresponding to the "obtaining", "sending", and "retrieving steps". Accordingly, the difference between the claimed subject matter of the '080 application and the instant application relates to the difference between "sensing a change in the program" and "receiving a user command" in addition to "storing the retrieved content". With respect to the automation of retrieving supplemental content, the Wu et al. reference discloses that the limitation of "sensing a change in the program" in conjunction with the retrieval of supplemental content is known in the art (Col 2, Lines 41-65; Col 8, Lines 10-31; Col 9, Lines 1-27; Col 11, Lines 3-17). Furthermore, it has been held that broadly providing an

automatic means to replace a manual activity which has accomplished the same result involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to automate the retrieval of supplemental content based upon a "change in the television program" for the purpose of advantageously providing an automated means for supplemental content retrieval based upon changing programming. The act of "storing the retrieved content" is an inherent feature in conjunction with interactive television systems such the information is temporarily buffered prior to display.

Claims 4, 7-23, 26-30, 34, 37-53, and 56-60 of the instant application correspond to claims 2-20, 24-29, 31-49, and 54-60 of the earlier '080 application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 13, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 35-37, 40, 41, 43, 48, 50, 51, 54, 56, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu et al. (US Pat No. 6,326,982).

In consideration of claims 1 and 31, the Wu et al. reference discloses a system comprising a "set-box" [12] for implementing a method of "selectively retrieving and

displaying supplemental content related to a television program being displayed by an interactive television system" (Col 2, Lines 19-26). The method comprises "sensing a change in the television program being displayed by obtaining contextual information pertaining to the television program" such as the current time and selected channel (Col 2, Lines 41-65; Col 8, Lines 10-31; Col 9, Lines 1-27; Col 11, Lines 3-17), "sending an information request to a content source, the information request comprising the contextual information" (Col 3, Lines 7-13; Col 8, Lines 32-37; Col 9, Lines 28-40), and "in response to the content source identifying supplemental content related to the television program being displayed based upon the contextual information, retrieving the supplemental content from the content source" (Col 3, Lines 14-19; Col 9, Lines 49-57) whereupon the system inherently "stores the retrieved supplemental content in the interactive television system for subsequent display thereby."

Claims 5 and 35 are rejected wherein the "sensing comprises detecting a channel change" (Col 11, Lines 3-17).

Claims 6 and 36 are rejected wherein the system "repeats the sensing, retrieving, and storing steps at periodic intervals while the television program is being displayed by the interactive television system" (Col 11, Lines 3-17).

Claims 7 and 37 are rejected wherein "the contextual information comprises an indication of the television program being displayed" in the form of the channel currently being displayed and associated time index (Col 9, Lines 1-27).

Claims 10 and 40 are rejected wherein the method further comprises “searching the content source for supplemental content related to the indication of the television program” (Col 9, Lines 28-40).

Claims 11 and 41 are rejected wherein “the contextual information comprises a time index” (Col 9, Lines 12-27).

Claims 13 and 43 are rejected wherein the method further comprises “searching the content source for supplemental content related to a particular time segment of the television program based upon the time index” (Col 9, Lines 28-40; Col 10, Lines 14-37)

Claims 18, 20, 48, and 50 are rejected wherein “the information request comprises an identifier of the interactive television system” such as the user ID associated with the terminal (Col 9, Lines 1-6) and the “retrieving” comprises “sending the identified supplemental content from the content source to an interactive television system associated with the identifier” (Col 8, Lines 10-31).

Claims 21 and 51 are rejected wherein “the contextual information comprises an indication of a channel being displayed” which is subsequently “used . . . to identify a content source to receive the information request” (Col 9, Lines 28-40; Col 10, Lines 64 – Col 11, Line 2).

Claims 24 and 54 are rejected wherein the “retrieving” comprises “filtering the supplemental content according to a set of user preferences” (Col 10, Lines 22-63).

Claims 26 and 56 are rejected wherein “the information request comprises an identifier of the interactive television system, and wherein the user preferences are stored at the content

source and accessed using the identifier of the interactive television system” (Col 10, Lines 22-63).

Claims 28 and 58 are rejected wherein “at least one user preference indicates a type of supplemental content preferred by the user” (Col 6, Lines 15-33; Col 7, Lines 1-10).

Claims 29 and 59 are rejected wherein “at least one user preference indicates a source of supplemental content preferred by the user” according to their particular profile (Col 10, Lines 22-63).

10. Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 11-13, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-34, 37, 39, 41-43, 52, 54, 57, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dodson et al. (US Pat No. 6,184,877).

In consideration of claims 1 and 31, the Dodson et al. reference discloses a system comprising a “set-box” [102] for implementing a method of “selectively retrieving and displaying supplemental content related to a television program being displayed by an interactive television system” (Col 1, Line 59 – Col 2, Line 3). The method comprises “sensing a change in the television program being displayed by obtaining contextual information pertaining to the television program” upon a user initiated search (Col 3, Lines 8-28 and 57-67), “sending an information request to a content source, the information request comprising the contextual information” (Col 4, Lines 9-17, 28-34, and 42-59), and “in response to the content source identifying supplemental content related to the television program being displayed based upon the contextual information, retrieving the supplemental content from the content source” whereupon the system “stores the retrieved supplemental content in the interactive television system for subsequent display thereby” either inherently

associated with the necessary information buffering prior to display and/or via user initiation (Figures 8-9; Col 5, Lines 9-52)

In consideration of claims 2 and 32, method further comprises “displaying the stored supplemental content using the interactive television system” “in response to receiving a user command to find supplemental content related to the television program being displayed” (Figures 4-5; Col 3, Lines 41-56).

Claims 3 and 33 are rejected wherein “in response to receiving a user command to find supplemental content related to the television program being displayed”, the system “displays a list of stored supplemental content items retrieved from the content source” (Figure 4). Upon “receiving a user selection of a supplemental content item from the list”, the system subsequently “displays the selected supplemental content item using the interactive television system” (Figure 5).

Claims 4 and 34 are rejected wherein the aforementioned “user command is received in response to a user activating a specifically-designated button on a remote control device for the interactive television system” [212’/218’].

Claims 7 and 37 are rejected wherein “the contextual information comprises an indication of the television program being displayed” in the form of the channel currently being displayed and associated time index (Col 3, Lines 8-28).

Claims 9 and 39 are rejected wherein the aforementioned “obtaining . . . [includes] reading the indication of the television program from electronic programming guide (EPG) data associated with the television program” (Col 3, Lines 8-28).

Claims 11 and 41 are rejected wherein “the contextual information comprises a time index” (Col 3, Lines 8-28).

Claims 12 and 42 are rejected wherein “the time index indicates a time at which a user command is received to find supplemental content related to the television program” (Col 3, Lines 8-28).

Claims 13 and 43 are rejected wherein the method further comprises “searching the content source for supplemental content related to a particular time segment of the television program based upon the time index” (Col 3, Lines 8-28).

Claims 22 and 52 are rejected wherein the method further comprises “displaying the supplemental content simultaneously with the television program.”

Claims 24 and 54 are rejected wherein the “retrieving” comprises “filtering the supplemental content according to a set of user preferences” (Figures 4-5).

Claims 25, 27, 55, and 57 are rejected wherein “the set of user preferences is included with the information request” in the form of user submitted keywords or search terms which further serve to “indicate a type of supplemental content to exclude” or those documents that do not comprise the associated keywords (Col 3, Lines 28-40; Col 4, Lines 42-59).

11. Claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 15, 22, 23, 31, 37, 40, 44, 45, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wong et al. (US Pat No. 6,748,375).

In consideration of claims 1 and 31, the Wong et al. reference discloses a system comprising a “set-box” [120] for implementing a method of “selectively retrieving and displaying supplemental content related to a television program being displayed by an interactive television system” (Col 1, Lines 26-44). The method comprises “sensing a

change in the television program being displayed by the obtaining contextual information pertaining to the television program” such as a change in the closed captioning text, “sending an information request to a content source, the information request comprising the contextual information”, and “in response to the content source identifying supplemental content related to the television program being displayed based upon the contextual information, retrieving the supplemental content from the content source” whereupon the system “stores the retrieved supplemental content in the interactive television system for subsequent display thereby” (Col 3, Line 24 – Col 4, Line 50).

Claims 7 and 37 are rejected wherein “the contextual information comprises an indication of the television program being displayed” in the form of keywords generated from the closed captioning text of that program (Col 3, Lines 45-52).

Claims 10 and 40 are rejected wherein the method further comprises “searching the content source for supplemental content related to the indication of the television program” wherein the supplemental content comprises URLs corresponding to websites (Col 3, Line 45 – Col 4, Line 50; Col 5, Line 54 – Col 6, Line 32).

Claims 14 and 44 are rejected wherein “the contextual information comprises at least one keyword obtained from closed-captioning text associated with the television program” (Col 3, Lines 45-52).

Claims 15 and 45 are wherein the method further comprises “searching the content source for supplemental content comprising the at least one keyword” (Col 3, Line 45 – Col 4, Line 50; Col 5, Line 54 – Col 6, Line 32).

Claims 22 and 52 are rejected wherein the method further comprises “displaying the supplemental content simultaneously with the television program” (Figure 1).

Claims 23 and 53 are rejected wherein the system further “reduces the size of the displayed television program relative to the size of the displayed supplemental content” such that the “television program” [50] is displayed as a partial screen as opposed to being a traditional full screen display of the program by a WebTV™ client.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 19 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (US Pat No. 6,326,982).

In consideration of claims 19 and 49, the references do not explicitly disclose nor preclude that the “the identifier comprises one of a media access control (MAC) address and in Internet protocol (IP) address.” The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that the usage of “one of a media access control (MAC) address and in Internet protocol (IP) address in connection with routing information to client terminals is notoriously well known in the art. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to employ “one of a media access control (MAC) address and in Internet protocol (IP) address” for the purpose of providing a means for routing retrieved supplementary content to the requesting receiver in accordance to the standard TCP/IP protocol utilized by the Internet.

15. Claims 8 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al. (US Pat No. 6,748,375).

In consideration of claims 8 and 38, the Wong et al. reference discloses the usage of any broadcast television video format in conjunction with the delivery of closed captioning information. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known in the art for closed captioning information to be delivered via the vertical blanking interval in accordance with analog television broadcast standards (ex. NTSC). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize the Wong et al. et al. system in connection with an analog television broadcast standard such as NTSC such that the aforementioned “obtaining . . . [includes] reading the indication of the television program from vertical blanking interval (VBI) data associated with the television program” for the purpose of utilizing the invention with a well-known and

- broadly available transmission or data formatting standards as suggested by Wong et al. (Col 5, Lines 28-40).
16. Claims 16, 17, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al. (US Pat No. 6,748,375) in view of Mighdoll et al. (US Pat No. 5,918,013).

In consideration of claims 16, 17, 46, and 47, the Wong et al. system discloses the reference discloses the retrieval of the “supplemental content” in conjunction with a “content provider” [150/160]. Accordingly, the reference does not particularly disclose the usage of a local “content source” that subsequently relies upon a global infrastructure to locate “supplemental content”. The Mighdoll et al. reference discloses a system wherein “in response to supplemental content . . . not being found at the content source, the system searches a global information network for supplemental content comprising the at least one keyword; and retrieves the supplemental content from the global information network for storage in the interactive television system” (Figure 6; Col 8, Line 28 – Col 9, Line 36). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the Wong et al. embodiment so as to employ a tiered retrieval process involving caching at a local “content source” wherein if a particular request cannot be locally fulfilled then a “global infrastructure” request is relied upon for the purpose of improving latency requirements associated with the download of requested documents (Mighdoll et al.: Col 1, Line 54 – Col 2, Line 7).

17. Claims 30 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US Pat No. 6,184,877) in view of Reese (US Pat No. 6,374,237).

In consideration of claims 30 and 60, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose nor preclude the particular usage of “at least one user preference” being “stored in response to historical analysis of user selections of supplemental content” in conjunction with the request for supplemental content. The Reese reference discloses the usage of “at least one user preference stored in response to historical analysis of user selections of supplemental content” to be used for filtering responses in accordance with a profile when responding to a user generated search request (Col 2, Lines 49-65; Col 3, Lines 20-32 and 45-58; Col 8, Lines 26-53). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to use “at least one user preference stored in response to historical analysis of user selections of supplemental content” in conjunction with Dodson et al. for the purpose of providing means for filtering retrieved search results into a format that is more meaningful to the user (Reese: Col 1, Lines 22-51).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made.

- The Goldschmidt Iki et al. (US Pat No. 6,601,103) reference discloses a method and apparatus for providing personalized supplemental programming based upon searching currently broadcast programming.

- The Leak et al. (US Pat No. 6,668,378) reference discloses a system and method for caching content associated with broadcast triggers.
- The Levitan (US Pat No. 6,698,023) reference discloses a technique for caching web pages associated with television broadcasts so as to enable the user to instantly access them.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 703-305-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 703-305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SEB
September 14, 2004



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600